REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-19, 21-34, 36-49, and 51-60 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-4, 6-19, 21-34, 36-49, and 51-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's assertion on page 4 of the pending Office Action stating, "Every embodiment of the invention responds to a 'detection' of errors, and not to 'indications' of errors (see specification Summary and Abstract)."

Applicant discloses, on page 11, line 17 of Applicant's Specification, "In step 403, a data integrity error is detected in a first vertical redundant relationship." Applicant submits that when a data integrity error is detected in a vertical redundant relationship, it is unknown whether there is a data integrity error in the checksum or in the data block corresponding to the particular vertical redundant relationship. Applicant discloses, on page 12, lines 1-3 of Applicant's Specification, "The detection of a single data integrity error in one of the vertical redundant relationships can indicate that either the data block and/or its corresponding checksum contains an error." (Emphasis added) Therefore, the detection of a data integrity error in a vertical redundant relationship is an indication of a data integrity error in the corresponding data block; however, additional diagnosis may be necessary to determine whether the data integrity error in the checksum and/or in the data block. Applicant discloses, on page 12, lines 3-4 of Applicant's Specification, "The process described herein with respect to FIGS. 4a-4e can provide a diagnosis and possible repair methodology for the error." (Emphasis added) For example, when a data integrity error is detected in exactly one of the vertical redundant relationships, the diagnosis to determine whether the checksum and/or the data block contains the error is disclosed on page 15, lines 13-18 of Applicant's Specification,

> "FIG. 4e illustrates the methodology used when a single checksum error condition is identified. In this situation, either or both the strip unit and its corresponding checksum are corrupted. In step 442, a stripe parity integrity test is performed to

20

determine whether a data integrity error exists in the horizontal redundancy relationship 306. If there is no error in the stripe parity, <u>it is concluded that the stripe unit contains valid data</u> and its checksum is restored in step 444." (Emphasis added)

Applicant accordingly respectfully submits that the claimed features of claims 1-4, 6-19, 21-34, 36-49, and 51-60 are supported by the specification. In view of the above arguments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-76700/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,

B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date:_____7 -29 -07_____